

**UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA**

**CIVIL MINUTES**

<b>Date:</b> 1/25/24	<b>1:06-4:30</b> (Reported)	<b>Judge:</b> Peter H. Kang
<b>Case No.:</b> <a href="#">22-md-03047-YGR</a>	<b>Case Name:</b> In Re: Social Media Adolescent Addiction/Personal Injury Products Liability Litigation	

**Attorney for Plaintiff:** Christopher Ayers, Lexi Hazam, Previn Warren, Emily Jeffcott, Thomas Huynh

**Attorney for Defendant:** (Meta) Ashley Simonsen, Isaac Chaput  
 (Snap) Jonathan Blavin  
 (TikTok) Geoffrey Drake, Andrea Pierson, Amy Fiterman  
 (YouTube) Matt Donohue

**Deputy Clerk:** Julia Fox

**Court Reporter:** Ruth Ekhaus

**PROCEEDINGS**

Discovery hearing held on 1/25/2024.

The Court heard arguments regarding ESI Protocol dispute [Dkt. 534]. Issues 1-8 were taken under advisement. Issues 9 and 10 stipulated as resolved. The Court directed the Parties to continue to meet and confer on certain ESI issues. Written Order re: ESI to follow.

The Court heard arguments from the Parties regarding their competing proposed discovery plans and proposed schedules. The Court set a deadline of February 22, 2024 for all Parties to serve their Rule 26(a) Initial Disclosures. The Court denied the AG Plaintiffs' verbal motion to be exempt from having to serve Initial Disclosures. The Court denied a verbal motion from Meta requesting a deadline for Plaintiffs to complete all written discovery requests within eight weeks of the entry of the Court's discovery plan and scheduling order. The Parties were ordered to meet and confer regarding limits on interrogatories, requests for admissions, and depositions. The Court advised the Parties to allocate limits for common interrogatories (to be served by all plaintiffs as a "side" or group), as well as individual limits for party-specific interrogatories. The Court advised the Parties to follow the same approach when meeting and conferring on limits for requests for admissions and depositions. The Court denied the State AG Plaintiffs' verbal motion to be exempt from producing their client-witnesses for depositions. The Court heard argument and provided guidance on the dispute regarding whether to modify the Protective Order to add a proposed "law enforcement sharing" provision. The Court admonished the Parties to include in their monthly Joint Status Reports on discovery a fulsome summary of all discovery disputes which the Parties are meeting and conferring on, as set forth in the Court December 12, 2023 Text Order [Dkt. 498]. Written Order re Discovery Plan and Schedule to follow.